

REMARKS

The present invention provides a "wall-mountable" data interface between users' personal data devices and a data infrastructure that facilitates the openness and ease of use of the data infrastructure. In particular, the "wall-mountable data interface" has -- all contained within its common "enclosure" -- a "user-side communication interface", an "infrastructure-side communication interface", and a "data interface management processor". Logically-interposed between the communication interfaces, the management processor is operative to inform a user of a personal data device of the communicative connection(s) of that device to other computer resources through said data interface, as well as services available through said resources, thereby enabling user self-service activities.

Claims 21 to 25 and 27 to 30 are pending. Claim 21 is the only independent claim.

All stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103, as unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,459,727, issued to G. Vanucci on October 17, 1995 (hereinafter, the "Vanucci reference"), in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,757,521, issued to J. Ying on June 29, 2004 (hereinafter, the "Ying reference").

All claims are amended. Reconsideration is requested.

In the Office action, the examiner responds to the applicants' argument pertaining to the broad sources and kinds of information made available through applicant's "management processor". The examiner states: "Vanucci discloses a communication connection between the infrastructure-side communication connection between the infrastructure-side communication interface and at least one of the plurality of the computer resources, and about services available from the plurality of computer resources (providing a widespread use for business communications because of its flexibility of allowing one to design specific services in accordance with one's business needs".

Applicant appreciates the examiner's observation. But, it is inconsequential. Applicants' claims do define the kind and sources of information made available through the "management processor" to, for example, a PDA or smartphone. But, that cannot be viewed in isolation as defining the entirety of applicants' invention. It is again reiterated that applicant's claims make clear that the "information" provided to the "personal data device" is provided by a "data interface management processor **within the enclosure**". (Emphasis added.) That "enclosure" -- as defined in claim 21 -- also contains applicants' "user-side communication interface", applicants' "infrastructure-side communication interface", and a "jack" (oriented to face outside the wall when the enclosure is mounted therein).

The mechanical relationships of these component were already sufficiently clear in claim 21, as previously present. Regardless, to add even further emphasis, each of applicants' claims is hereby amended to indicate that the "data interface" is a "wall-mountable data interface". The amendment neither broadens nor narrows the subject matter of the claims, and is introduced merely to focus attention on the compact structural scale of the claimed subject matter in contrast to the art references of record.

Both art references were reviewed. Both are directed to comparatively large telecommunication systems, not to wall-mountable data jacks. They, alone or combined, do not disclose or suggest applicants' claimed subject matter.

In particular, the Vanucci reference is directed to a comparatively large PBX system comprising multiple telephones, wherein the only mention of data jacks is a non-descriptive reference to the existence of "redundant jacks in each room" in an exemplary installation. (Col. 3, line 18). And, as to the Ying reference, the subject matter disclosed is a monitoring system for a massive enterprise-scale network that involves a bus (i.e., a vehicle) to drive by and monitor several and various terrestrial ground stations within that network. Ying's disclosure does not delve into the details of the data jacks utilized in the ground stations.


In sum, claim 21 defines subject matter not obviated by the combined Vanucci and Ying references. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 is requested.

As to claims 22 to 30, applicants acknowledge and appreciate the examiner's observations. Claims 22 to 30, however, are all ultimately dependent on claim 21. Claims 22 to 30 are thus also not obviated by the Vanucci reference in view of the Ying reference. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 22 to 30 is also requested.

Conclusion

The pending claims define subject matter neither described nor suggested by the cited art references. The written description, claims, and drawings meet all applicable statutory requirements. The application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Renato M. de Luna
Registration No. 36,780
3COM CORPORATION
350 Campus Drive
Marlborough, MA 01752
Telephone: 508-323-1265

RMD/—

Certificate of Mailing/Transmission (37 CFR 1.8)


I hereby certify that this correspondence is, on the date shown below, being:

Mailing

☐ deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Electronically

☒ transmitted electronically via EFS to the United States Patent and Trademark Office.



Renato M. de Luna, Reg. No. 36,780
Date: February 11, 2008